

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed May 19, 2006 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-25, 27, 28, 33-39, 44-49, 51-58, 60-64, and 66-72 were pending in the application. Claims 2, 33, 44, 51, 58, 60-63 and 66 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-25, 27, 28, 33-39, 44-49, 51-58, 60-64, and 66-72 are pending in the application and are submitted for reconsideration.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Rejection Under § 101

Claims 58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. By way of this amendment and reply, claim 58 has been amended to recite a computer program product embodied in computer readable media executable by a computer.

Accordingly, applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under § 112, second paragraph

Claims 58-63 are rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By way of this amendment and reply, claim 58 has been amended to change “receiver” to “translator”, thereby overcoming the antecedent basis problem in that claim.

Accordingly, applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 10-14, 19-25, 27, 28, 33-39, 44-49, 51-58, 60-64, and 66-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

Application publication No. 2002/0099735 to Shroeder et al. (hereafter “Shroeder”) in view of U.S. patent 6,823,495 to Vedula et al. (hereafter “Vedula”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action (on page 5) correctly recognizes that Schroeder does not explicitly disclose the use of source and target models, but incorrectly asserts that Vedula rectifies these shortcomings of Schroeder.

While Vedula describes a method for creating a mapping between a source object and a destination or target object which may be schemas, Vedula does not teach or suggest the creation of a separate data model to read in data and a separate data model to read out data for each of a plurality of transactions. Rather, Vedula provides a source object schema and a target object schema for one transaction.

Furthermore, Schroeder discloses a generic super map 402 for all possible data segments and data types for a given type of document. Schroeder’s generic super map 402 for a transaction type is not generated from a standard data model (of the trading partner), whereby the supposed incorporation of the teachings of Vedula into the method of Schroeder would totally change the operation of Schroeder, and whereby such changes would not have been done by one skilled in the art, without hindsight knowledge of the claimed invention. In other words, one skilled in the relevant art would not be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Vedula into the system and method of Schroeder, since that would totally change the operation of Schroeder.

The dependent claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons, as discussed above, as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole. For example, dependent claim 44 recites that the step of receiving a manual entry of parameters comprises receiving user input of an EDI standard, a version of the standard, a transaction set, and a direction. Applicants disagree with the Office Action’s assertion that “whether such entry is manual or automatic was merely an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention”, since manual entry means that a user is entering in data based on his/her desires,

as opposed to an automatic entry of parameters based on some software program or the like, whereby in that case a user cannot enter his/her desired parameters.

Accordingly, claim 44 is patentable for these additional reasons.

Also, dependent claims 2-5 are directed to receiving user input of one or more of an EDI standard, a version of standard, or a transaction set which allows for the claimed data models to be customized. No such customized data models (for read in and read out data) are taught or suggested by Schroeder. In fact, Schroeder's super map teaches away from this customization by teaching a super map that includes all the data segments and elements for a particular transaction. Again, the ability to allow a user to enter in his/her own data is much different, and not a variant, from an automated system that does not allow such user inputs, whereby the system of Schroeder would not be amenable to the "user inputted" features as recited in claims 2-5.

Accordingly, claims 2-5 are patentable for these additional reasons.

Also, with respect to presently pending claims 2, 33, 44, 51 and 66, those claims recite receiving user input of mapping rules for the standard data model. Such features, which are described in paragraph 0046 of the specification, are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record, when taken as a whole.

Accordingly, claims 2, 33, 44, 51 and 66 are patentable for these additional reasons.

Conclusion

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated,

otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 7, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819